

### REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on December 23, 2003.

Claims 68-70, 82, and 92 are amended herein, and no claims are canceled or added. As a result, claims 68-95 remain pending in the Application.

### Objection to Claims

Claims 69 and 70 were objected to due to informalities. Amendments made herein to these claims obviate the objections.

### §112 Rejections of the Claims

Claims 68-95 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as indefinite, alleging that two of the recitations in each independent claim contradict each other. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Preliminarily, independent claim 68 is amended to recite “each of” at least three devices, to provide proper antecedent basis for “the each device” set forth later in the claim.

The Office Action states on page 4 lines 5-6 that “multiple source modes identifying at least one other device and without identifying any of the devices’ are contradict [*sic*] to each other.” However, this is an inaccurate quotation of the claim language. What claim 68 actually recites is “multiple source modes each identifying at least one other mutually different device of the plurality of devices *to receive data from the each device* without identifying any of the devices *to provide data to the each device*” (emphasis supplied). For example, one source mode  $SRC_{T,1}$  for a device  $T$ (elephone) may specify that device  $C$ (omputer) is to receive data from device  $T$ , and another source mode  $SRC_{T,2}$  for the same device  $T$  may specify that device  $G$ (ateway) is to receive data from  $T$ . The point of the claim recitation is that neither  $SRC_{T,1}$  nor  $SRC_{T,2}$  requires that devices  $C$  or  $G$  provide data back to device  $T$ .<sup>1</sup> In fact neither of these source modes identifies *any* particular device that *must* “provide data to the each device.”

---

<sup>1</sup> --Of course, they may do so; but only if the streaming controller selects the appropriate source modes for deices  $C$  and  $G$ .

The recitation of the sink modes is similar: “multiple sink modes each identifying at least one other device of the plurality of devices *to provide data to the each device* without identifying any of the devices *to receive data from the each device*” (emphasis supplied). As an example, one sink mode  $SNK_{T,1}$  for a device  $T$  may specify that device  $T$  is to receive data from device  $C$ , and another sink mode  $SNK_{T,2}$  for the same device  $T$  may specify that device  $T$  is to receive data from  $G$ . Neither  $SNK_{T,1}$  nor  $SNK_{T,2}$  requires that devices  $C$  or  $G$  receive data from  $T$ .<sup>2</sup> Again, neither of these source modes identifies *any* particular device that *must* “receive data from the each device.”

The language of claim 68 declares that each of the other two of the “three devices” also has the ability to select a data source without identifying a data sink for the same device, and to identify a data sink without identifying a data source for the device. Corresponding recitations of independent method claim 82 and article claim 92 employ similar language, and likewise meet the definiteness requirements of 35 USC §112.

### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 68-70, 78, 79, 82-85, 87, 89 and 92-95 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda et al. (U.S. 6,404,873). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The above resolution of the indefiniteness rejections points the way to distinguishing the cited art as well. Page 11 item c of the Office Action responds to Applicant’s previous argument that Applicant’s argument “is moot in views [*sic*] of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.” But, as outlined above, not only is claim 68 consistent, it advances a capability not possible in Beyda. Beyda’s links are all bidirectional; identifying device  $A$  to source data to device  $B$  necessarily entails identifying device  $A$  to sink data from device  $B$ .

This is not so in claim 68, where the multiple source modes each identify at least one other mutually different device of the plurality of devices *to receive data from the each device* “without identifying any of the devices *to provide data to the each device*” (emphasis supplied). Conversely, multiple sink modes each identify at least one other device of the plurality of

---

<sup>2</sup>--Again,  $C$  and/or  $G$  could receive data from device  $T$ , if the streaming controller selects the appropriate sink nodes for devices  $C$  and  $G$ .

devices to provide data to the each device “without identifying any of the devices to receive data from the each device.”

Claim 68 goes on to recite that the streaming controller selects among the multiple source modes and the multiple sink modes “independently of each other” for any of three devices. Continuing the example of the previous section, the controller may choose the combination of  $SRC_{T,1}$  and  $SNK_{T,2}$  for device  $T$ , so that device  $T$  provides data to device  $C$ , but the same device  $T$  receives data back from device  $G$ , rather than from the same device to which it provides data, device  $C$ . To connect this example to particular modes in the Specification, suppose that  $SRC_{T,1}$  and  $SNK_{AT2}$  correspond to source mode 5 and sink mode 1 respectively, for telephone 112. Source mode 5 causes the telephone (in the role of device  $T$ ) as a source to provide data to computer 110 (as device  $C$ ). But independently chosen telephone sink mode 1 causes telephone 112 to receive data, not from the computer, but from server/gateway 108 (device  $G$ ). The network is now configured so that a person picking up the telephone speaks to the computer, but hears the gateway. Beyda cannot perform such a connection, nor does he suggest either a capability or a motivation for doing so.

Language added to claim 68 makes explicit what was already implicit in the original claim.<sup>3</sup> The capability provided by independent source and sink modes allows that “at least a first of the three devices is configurable to provide data to a second of the devices in the plurality without providing data to a third device in the plurality, and is configurable to receive data from the third device without receiving data from the second device.” In the foregoing example,  $T$  provides data to  $C$  but not to  $G$ , and  $T$  receives data from  $G$  but not from  $C$ .

Independent claims 82 and 92 are similar to claim 68 in the above respects. Dependent claims 69-70, 78-79, 83-85,, 87, 89, and 93-95 incorporate all the features of their respective parents, and thus also distinguish the Beyda reference in a patentable manner.

Dependent claims 71-77 and 86 were also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Beyda et al. in view of Perrone (U.S. 6,418,199). However, the mere showing of a gateway in Perrone cannot make up the above-noted deficiencies of the primary Beyda reference, and these rejections are also traversed.

---

<sup>3</sup> --Because it follows from the remainder of the claim, this recitation does not narrow the scope of the claim.

## AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 - EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial Number: 09/470292

Filing Date: December 22, 1999

Title: CONTROL OF STREAMING OF SIGNALS IN A LOCAL AREA NETWORK

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 11

Dkt: 884.181US1 (INTEL)

The rejections of dependent claims 80, 81, 90 and 91 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Beyda et al. in view of Klug (U.S. 5,799,320) are traversed for the same reason. Klug's locks make no headway against Beyda's shortcomings.

The rejection of dependent claim 88 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Beyda et al. in view of Cohn et al. (U.S. 6,411,684) falls short in that the mere addition of voice/text conversion cannot cure Beyda's infirmities.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicant urges that all the claims fulfill the statutory requirements, and respectfully requests their allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6971 if deemed helpful in advancing the prosecution of this case.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GLENN D. BEGIS

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 373-6971

Date 23 March 2004

By

J. Michael Anglin  
Reg. No. 24,916

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 23 day of March 2004.

KACIA LEE

Name

Kacia Lee

Signature